

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ful

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	10/772,066	02/04/2004	Rainer Gluck	00655P1236US	4530
		7590 02/12/200 LIPS, KATZ, CLARK	•	EXAMINER	
500 W. MADISON STREET				LEO, LEONARD R	
	SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL	60661		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3744	
_					
	SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DÉLIVERY MODE	
	3 MO	NTHS	02/12/2007	PAP	ER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	:
	10/772,066	GLUCK, RAINER	: .
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	<u> </u>
	Leonard R. Leo	3744	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence addre	ess
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the inailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become A	ICATION. The reply be timely filed PNTHS from the mailing date of this commandation (as U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 C	October 2006.		
	s action is non-final.	· · ·	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal ma	tters, prosecution as to the m	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	•
Disposition of Claims			
 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are pending in the application 	1	•	• •
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>5,7,10,14,19,21,24,2</u>		withdrawn from consideration	1
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			•
6) Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,8,9,11-13,15-18,20,22,23,25-2</u>	7,29-32,34,36,37 and 39-	<u>41</u> is/are rejected.	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•	;
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			:
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	•	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	. :
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			•
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			• •
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-	152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			:
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	•
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		n received in this National Sta	ige
application from the International Burea			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies no	t received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (i-TO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application	

Art Unit: 3744

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of the species IIA of Figure 1, the species of IB of Figure 1 and the species of claims 13, 27 and 41 in the reply filed on October 31, 2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 5, 7, 10, 14, 19, 21, 24, 28, 33, 35, 38 and 42 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Objections

Claim 16 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

The claim is a dual recitation of claim 15, last indented paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3744

Regarding claims 8 and 36, the phrase "preferably" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 8, 12, 29, 36, 40 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ostbo. Ostbo discloses first end plate 4 having a fluid connector with a first plane and a second plane forming an acute angle, a second end plate 5, intermediate plates 8, and fluid line 7. Furthermore, the recitation of "drawn" is considered to be a method limitation in an apparatus claim, which bears no patentable weight in this instance. See MPEP 2113.

Regarding claims 8 and 36, as permissibly gleaned from the drawings, the acute angle is about 70 degrees.

Regarding claims 12 and 40, Ostbo discloses manifold 10 in the plates 8.

Claims 1, 8-9, 12, 29, 36-37, 40 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tajima et al. Tajima et al discloses first end plate 111 having a fluid connector with a first plane (i.e. parallel to upper plate 103) and a second plane (i.e. coinciding with hole 111B) forming an acute angle, a second end plate 101, intermediate plates 3, 5, and fluid line 131, 133. Furthermore, the recitation of "drawn" is considered to be a method limitation in an apparatus claim, which bears no patentable weight in this instance. See MPEP 2113.

Art Unit: 3744

Regarding claims 8 and 36, as permissibly gleaned from the drawings, the acute angle is about 65 degrees.

Regarding claims 9 and 37, the recitation of "soldered" is considered to be a method limitation in an apparatus claim, which bears no patentable weight in this instance. See MPEP 2113.

Regarding claims 12 and 40, Tajima et al discloses manifold 67 in the plates 3, 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 6, 9, 15-18, 20, 23, 30-32, 34 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostbo in view of Armes.

Ostbo discloses all the claimed limitations except the fluid line extending over the end plate.

Armes discloses a plate heat exchanger comprising a first end plate 16 having a connector 12 with hole 46, a second end plate 18, intermediate plates 20, and fluid line 46' extending over the first end plate for the purpose of meeting plumbing requirements.

Since Ostbo and Armes are both from the same field of endeavor and/or analogous art, the purpose disclosed by Armes would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Ostbo.

Art Unit: 3744

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Ostbo fluid line extending over the first end plate for the purpose of meeting plumbing requirements as recognized by Armes.

Regarding claims 3, 17 and 31, the fluid line 46' of Armes is roughly parallel to the first end plate 16.

Regarding claims 4, 6, 18, 20, 32 and 34, Armes discloses auxiliary support 14 with an upstanding flange soldered to the first end plate 16 to support the fluid line 46'. Furthermore, the recitation of "soldered" is considered to be a method limitation in an apparatus claim, which bears no patentable weight in this instance. See MPEP 2113.

Regarding claims 9, 23 and 37, Armes discloses fluid line 46' is soldered to the connector 14. Again, the recitation of "soldered" is considered to be a method limitation in an apparatus claim, which bears no patentable weight in this instance. See MPEP 2113.

Claims 11, 13, 25, 27, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostbo in view of Wright.

The device of Ostbo lacks a vent.

Wright discloses a plate heat exchanger comprising a first and second end plates 9 having a connectors, intermediate plates 8, fluid line 10, and vent 11 for the purpose of ease of maintenance.

Since Ostbo and Wright are both from the same field of endeavor and/or analogous art, the purpose disclosed by Wright would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Ostbo.

Page 6

Art Unit: 3744

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Ostbo a vent for the purpose of ease of maintenance as recognized by Wright.

Regarding claims 13, 27 and 41, Wright discloses the connector is concentric with the manifolds defined by holes 2-5.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonard R. Leo whose telephone number is (571) 272-4916. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on (571) 272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3744

LEONARD R. LEO PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 3744 Page 7

February 5, 2007